DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 174 154 HE 011 604

TITLE	Higher Education Faculty: Characteristics and Opinions. NEA Research Memo.
INSTITUTION	National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 79
NOTE	20p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Education Association, 1201 16th St., N.W., Washington, DC 20036 (NEA members, $1.50, stock number 1666-1-00; nonmembers $3.25, stock number 1666-1-10)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; Employment Practices; Faculty Advisors; *Faculty College Relationship; Faculty Development; Faculty Promotion; Faculty Workload; Financial Support; Higher Education; National Surveys; Part Time Teachers; *Personnel Policy; Policy Formation; Salary Differentials; State Government; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Morale; Teacher Salaries; Work Experience

ABSTRACT

In spring 1978 National Education Association Research surveyed a national sample of college faculty to obtain estimates of their professional activities, working conditions, characteristics, and opinions. The findings reported here are based on responses from 803 faculty members, or 56.2 of those sampled. Among the findings: the median age of faculty is 43 years; 60.7 percent of faculty have doctorates; 37.5 percent have elementary or secondary teaching experience; the median work time is 50 hours per week in a 39-week work year; the median teaching load is 12 class hours per week with 80 students, and includes counseling responsibilities for 20 undergraduates and 5 graduate students; 27.6 percent report fairly low or very low morale; 50.9 percent believe morale to be declining; 26.1 percent see important constraints in effect on personal academic freedom; over two-thirds see a need for improvement of due process procedures at their institutions; and 80.2 percent are concerned about the number of part-time faculty members currently in higher education. Areas in which faculty voice a need for improvement include: communication of faculty concerns to legislatures, boards of directors, and institutional administrators; information about salaries paid to other faculty in the same institution; assistance in handling complaints with local administration; faculty representation in policymaking; institutional policies for faculty employment practices; salary levels and equity; and institutional financial support for faculty development. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED174154

nea helping teachers teach
RESEARCH MEMO
National Education Association
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W. • Washington, D.C. 20036

Higher Education Faculty:

Characteristics and Opinions

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NEA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 011 604

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

JOHN RYOR, *President*
TERRY E. HERNDON, *Executive Director*

NEA RESEARCH

Frank W. Kovacs, *Director*

William E. Dresser
Assistant Manager
Graphics

Peg J. Jones
Manager
Research Services

Norma W. Plater
Assistant Manager
Administrative Services

Richard E. Scott
Manager
Computer and Statistical Programming

Simeon P. Taylor, III
Manager
Information Center

Donald P. Walker
Manager
Research Services

HIGHER EDUCATION FACULTY: CHARACTERISTICS AND OPINIONS

William S. Graybeal
Project Director

Sale copies: NEA members–$1.50 (Stock No. 1666-1-00)
Nonmembers –$3.25 (Stock No. 1666-1-10)

Payment must accompany all orders except for those on your official institutional purchase order forms; no orders can be billed for less than $10. Shipping and handling charges will be added to all billed purchase orders. NEA member discount: 10-49 copies, 10%; 50-99 copies, 15%; 100 or more copies, 20%. Order from the **NEA Distribution Center, The Academic Building, Saw Mill Road, West Haven, CT 06516.**

Reproduction: No part of this report may be reproduced in any form without written permission from NEA Research, except by NEA departments and affiliated associations. Any reproduction of the report materials must include the usual credit line and the copyright notice. Address communications to Nancy M. Greenberg, Editor.

Copyright © 1979
National Education Association
All Rights Reserved

CONTENTS

The Need for the Study 5

The Findings of the Study 5

The Technical Aspects of the Study 17

List of Tables

1. Selected Personal, Professional, and Assignment Characteristics of Higher Education Faculty, 1977-78 7-9

2. Work Load of Faculty in Higher Education, 1977-78 10

3. Teaching Load of Faculty Who Teach Full Time 11

4. Faculty Estimate of Personal Morale and Morale of Colleagues 12

5. Faculty Opinion About Considerations Related to Faculty Morale 13

6. Selected Institutional Environment Characteristics Related to Faculty Morale and Percent of Faculty Indicating That Their Condition Is Less Than Satisfactory 14

7. Percent of Faculty Reporting Opinion That Improvements Are Needed in Certain Institutional Practices 15

8. Percent of Faculty Who Are Inadequately Represented in the Development and/or Implementation of Selected Institutional Policies 16

9. Higher Education Faculty Who Have Taught in Elementary or Secondary Schools 17

10. Population and Sample Estimates of Faculty Distributed by Rank and Type of Institution, and of Faculty Who Are Women in Each Rank and Type of Institution Category 18

11. Sampling Estimates of the Distribution of Higher Education Faculty by Age, 1948 to 1978 19

12. Estimates of the Distribution of Higher Education by Highest Earned Degree, 1948 to 1978 19

HIGHER EDUCATION FACULTY: CHARACTERISTICS AND OPINIONS

In spring 1978 NEA Research surveyed a nationwide sample of higher education faculty to obtain estimates about their professional activities, working conditions, characteristics, and opinions. The study findings reported in this Research Memo are based on responses from 803 faculty, 56.2 percent of those sampled.

The sample design and a comparison of selected findings with those of other higher education surveys are presented under "The Technical Aspects of the Study." This section also comments on the disappointingly low response rate and the bias that may have been introduced by the sample design. Any conclusions drawn from this report should take into account the points discussed in the technical section.

The Need for the Study

A hallmark of the late 1970's has been the increased public concern about efficiency in public services and in education. Higher education is now receiving close attention as costs continue to rise significantly in the absence of major enrollment growth. Because most of the expenditures for higher education are invested in the faculty, even more critical public attention will be given in the 1980's to the quantitative and qualitative dimensions of the jobs of teaching faculty.

The surplus in the market for higher education faculty—accompanied by probable declining enrollments over the forthcoming 15 years—may contribute to reductions in higher education salaries and working conditions. To prevent any deterioration in services of faculty or of their working conditions that may result from the pressures of cost effectiveness, oversupply, and retrenchment, accurate information is needed. However, information on faculty work load and faculty opinions about their own working conditions has been meager, sporadic, and somewhat dated. Selected national estimates are available from a 1972-73 survey, and glimpses of a few aspects of faculty characteristics and opinions have been released from surveys conducted in 1975 and 1977.

The findings presented in *Higher Education Faculty: Characteristics and Opinions* will be useful in assessing current status, estimating trends, and planning for improvements in the quality of faculty services in higher education.

The Findings of the Study

- The median age of higher education faculty is 43 years, with first and third quartiles of 36 and 51 years, respectively.
- Three higher education faculty in five (60.7 percent) have the doctor's degree.
- Three higher education faculty in eight (37.5 percent) have had teaching experience in elementary-secondary schools.
- The typical higher education faculty member (median) works a 50-hour week in a 39-week employment year.
- The typical higher education faculty member teaching full-time (median) instructs three class sections (12 hours of class time each week) with 80 students enrolled and has official counseling responsibilities for 25 students (20 undergraduate and 5 graduate level).
- One-fourth (27.6 percent) of higher education faculty report that their morale is either fairly low or very low.
- One-half (50.9 percent) of faculty believe the morale of other faculty compared with that of five years ago seems to be either fairly low or very low.
- One higher education faculty member in four (26.1 percent) feels there are important constraints on personal academic freedom.
- Most faculty (69.1 percent) believe that due process procedures at their institutions need improving.

- Most faculty (80.2 percent) are concerned about the number of faculty employed part-time in higher education.
- Areas in which faculty say there is need for improvement include (1) communication of faculty priorities and interests to legislatures, boards of directors, and institutional administrators; (2) information about salaries paid to other faculty in the institution; (3) assistance in handling complaints with local administration; (4) faculty representation in developing policies for selecting campus administrators, for faculty censure or dismissal, and for student admission; (5) faculty representation in developing policies relating to faculty load; (6) institutional policies for faculty load, promotion, evaluation, and defining faculty merit; (7) salary levels, coupled with lack of equitable treatment of faculty in salaries; and (8) institutional financial support for faculty professional growth and travel.

The following eight tables provide statistical support for the highlights listed above. Selected personal, professional, and assignment characteristics of higher education faculty will be found in Table 1; the hours per week that faculty spend in the major categories of their total work load, in Table 2; and teaching load characteristics reported by full-time teaching faculty, in Table 3.

Also included are responses to questions about faculty morale (Table 4) and what is needed in various policies, practices, and working conditions to improve faculty morale (Tables 5 through 8).

TABLE 1.–SELECTED PERSONAL, PROFESSIONAL, AND ASSIGNMENT CHARACTERISTICS OF HIGHER EDUCATION FACULTY, 1977-78

Characteristic	Total faculty	Faculty in 2-year institutions	Faculty in 4-year or higher degree-granting institutions
1	2	3	4
Sex			
Percent who are female	25.6%	43.6%	20.9%
Age			
Mean	44.0 years	42.0 years	44.0 years
Standard error	0.3	0.8	0.4
Distribution			
Under age 30	4.0%	5.5%	3.7%
30-34 years	14.3	15.2	14.1
35-39 years	21.0	25.5	19.8
40-44 years	16.1	13.9	16.7
45-49 years	15.5	13.3	16.0
50-54 years	12.3	11.5	12.5
55-59 years	9.3	11.5	8.7
60-64 years	5.5	3.0	6.2
65 years or more	1.9	0.6	2.2
First quartile	36.0 years	35.0 years	36.0 years
Median	43.0	40.0	43.0
Third quartile	51.0	50.0	51.0
Highest earned degree			
Bachelor's	3.3%	8.0%	2.1%
Master's	33.1	71.2	23.3
Professional diploma or specialist degree or diploma based on six years of college study	1.6	3.1	1.3
Doctor's	60.7	15.3	72.4
Professional or technical certificate not in academic series	0.3	0.6	0.2
Other	1.0	1.8	0.8
Years of full-time teaching experience in higher education, including 1977-78			
Mean	13.0 years	10.0 years	14.0 years
Standard error	0.3	0.5	0.4
Distribution			
1-5 years	19.9%	22.7%	19.0%
6-10 years	30.3	38.8	28.1
11-15 years	19.8	24.2	18.7
16-20 years	11.9	6.7	13.3
21 or more years	17.9	6.6	20.9
First quartile	7.0 years	6.0 years	7.0 years
Median	10.0	9.0	11.0
Third quartile	17.0	12.0	19.0

(Continued on following pages)

TABLE 1.–SELECTED PERSONAL, PROFESSIONAL, AND ASSIGNMENT CHARACTERISTICS OF HIGHER EDUCATION FACULTY, 1977-78 (Continued)

Characteristic	Total faculty	Faculty in 2-year institutions	Faculty in 4-year or higher degree-granting institutions
1	2	3	4
Elementary or secondary school teaching experience			
Percent with this experience	37.5%	55.7%	32.7%
Mean years of experience	7.0 years	8.0 years	7.0 years
Standard error	0.4	0.7	0.5
First quartile	2.0 years	2.0 years	2.0 years
Median	5.0	5.0	4.0
Third quartile	9.0	10.0	9.0
Present assignment			
Full-time teaching	78.5%	90.2%	75.4%
Part-time teaching and part-time administration	12.5	5.5	14.3
Part-time teaching and part-time research	6.4	1.8	7.5
Professional support staff	0.5	0.6	0.5
Full-time administration	0.6	...	0.8
On sabbatical leave	0.9	0.6	1.0
On other leave	0.5	1.2	0.3
Other	0.1	...	0.2
Current faculty rank or title			
Professor	30.0%	4.9%	36.5%
Associate professor	26.1	15.9	28.8
Assistant professor	25.0	18.9	26.5
Instructor	11.9	36.6	5.5
Lecturer	1.3	1.8	1.1
Institution does not use ranks	5.4	20.7	1.4
Other	0.4	1.2	0.2
Type of appointment			
Tenure	69.5%	63.3%	69.8%
Nontenure	24.1	22.0	24.6
Tenure not applicable to my position	6.4	9.8	5.6
Years taught before being tenured			
Mean	6.0 years	5.0 years	6.0 years
Standard error	0.2	0.8	0.2
First quartile	3.0 years	3.0 years	4.0 years
Median	5.0	3.0	5.0
Third quartile	6.0	5.0	7.0

TABLE 1.–SELECTED PERSONAL, PROFESSIONAL, AND ASSIGNMENT CHARACTERISTICS OF HIGHER EDUCATION FACULTY, 1977-78 (Continued)

Characteristic	Total faculty	Faculty in 2-year institutions	Faculty in 4-year or higher degree-granting institutions
1	2	3	4
Weeks in employment year			
Mean	39.0 weeks	36.0 weeks	40.0 weeks
Standard error	0.3	0.6	0.3
First quartile	36.0 weeks	32.0 weeks	36.0 weeks
Median	39.0	36.0	40.0
Third quartile	45.0	40.0	48.0
Outside employment			
Percent employed part-time in another institution of higher education	4.3%	5.5%	4.0%
Employment status expected next year (1978-79)			
Employed full-time in this institution	90.0%	91.8%	89.6%
Employed full-time in another institution	2.5	1.3	2.8
Attending college or university full time	1.0	0.6	1.1
Working in an occupation related to my present teaching assignment	1.4	0.6	1.6
Working in a nonrelated, nonteaching occupation	1.2	2.5	0.8
Retired	0.8	. . .	1.0
In military service	0.4	. . .	0.5
On leave	1.2	0.6	1.3
Other	1.6	2.5	1.3
Professional periodicals (have read regularly or occasionally)[a]			
AAUP Bulletin	46.4%	44.1%	47.0%
Change	21.6	21.6	21.5
Chronicle of Higher Education	48.3	47.8	48.4
Educational Record	12.9	13.7	12.8
Journal of Higher Education	33.1	44.1	30.2
Improving College and University Teaching	14.0	17.3	13.2
NEA Advocate	19.2	33.7	15.4

[a]Other response options included: "Have not heard of it," "Have heard of it and have read it hardly at all," and "Have heard of it and have read it rarely, if at all."

TABLE 2.–WORK LOAD OF FACULTY IN HIGHER EDUCATION, 1977-78

Statistic	Weekly activity (hours)									Total hours spent in a typical week
	Teaching class	Preparing for classes	Class related evaluation[a]	Interacting with students out of class[b]	Research, scholarship, and/or creative activity[c]	Institutional service[d]	Professional development[e]	Public service[f]	Other	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Total faculty										
Mean	12	11	6	6	10	6	4	4	25	47
Standard error	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.2	2.1	0.5
Number	748	715	707	715	604	708	582	447	122	724
First quartile	8.0	6.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	5.0	40.0
Median	12.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	15.0	50.0
Third quartile	15.0	15.0	10.0	8.0	14.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	42.8	56.0
Faculty in 2-year institutions										
Mean	15	10	7	5	6	4	4	4	34	41
Standard error	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.7	0.3	0.4	0.8	4.8	1.1
Number	160	151	156	152	93	141	115	80	26	150
First quartile	12.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	10.0	35.0
Median	15.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	34.0	40.0
Third quartile	18.0	14.0	10.0	6.0	8.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	52.8	50.0
Faculty in 4-year or higher degree-granting institutions										
Mean	11	11	6	6	10	6	4	3	22	49
Standard error	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.2	2.3	0.5
Number	588	564	551	563	511	567	467	367	96	574
First quartile	6.0	6.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	5.0	40.0
Median	10.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	10.0	50.0
Third quartile	13.0	15.0	8.0	8.0	15.0	8.0	5.0	5.0	35.8	60.0

[a]Class-related evaluation (test preparation and scoring, term papers, other written work, etc.)

[b]Interacting with students out of class (conferring, advising, discussing–not including specific assigned student-service functions)

[c]Research, scholarship, and/or creative activity (writing, performing, painting, composing, analyzing, reviewing work of colleague, conducting scholarly research, etc.)

[d]Institutional service (faculty and departmental meetings, committee work, institutional functions, and the time needed to prepare for these; specifically assigned student-service activities and duties outside of the department; general administrative functions, records, etc.)

[e]Professional development (study and discussion related to teaching and scholarly pursuits, professional conferences, giving and receiving critiques of teaching performance, etc.)

[f]Public service (position-related activities outside of the institution, such as consulting, editing, survey design and interpretation, public lectures, etc.)

TABLE 3.–TEACHING LOAD OF FACULTY WHO TEACH FULL TIME

Statistic	Number of class sections taught	Average number of class/laboratory hours per week	Total students in all classes	Number of students currently served as official counselor or advisor	
				Undergraduate	Graduate
1	2	3	4	5	6
Total faculty					
Mean	3	13	95	28	9
Standard error	0.1	0.2	2.9	2.2	0.8
Number responding	672	699	700	495	288
First quartile	2.0	9.0	50.0	10.0	3.0
Median	3.0	12.0	80.0	20.0	5.0
Third quartile	4.0	15.0	120.0	30.0	10.0
Faculty in 2-year institutions					
Mean	4	16	111	25	10
Standard error	0.1	0.4	6.3	3.1	5.0
Number responding	143	155	157	100	2
First quartile	4.0	14.0	70.0	12.0	. . .
Median	4.0	15.0	95.0	20.0	. . .
Third quartile	5.0	18.0	137.5	25.0	. . .
Faculty in 4-year or higher degree-granting institutions					
Mean	3	12	90	28	9
Standard error	0.1	0.3	3.2	2.7	0.9
Number responding	529	544	543	395	286
First quartile	2.0	8.0	45.0	10.0	3.0
Median	3.0	12.0	75.0	20.0	5.0
Third quartile	4.0	14.8	116.0	35.0	10.0

TABLE 4.–FACULTY ESTIMATE OF PERSONAL MORALE AND MORALE OF COLLEAGUES

Category	Percent of faculty		
	Total faculty	Faculty in 2-year institutions	Faculty in 4-year or higher degree-granting institutions
1	2	3	4
My morale is–			
Very high	22.2%	23.6%	21.9%
Fairly high	50.2	49.7	50.3
Fairly low	22.6	19.4	23.4
Very low	5.0	7.3	4.4
The morale of other faculty seems to be–			
Very high	5.4%	3.7%	5.9%
Fairly high	52.7	53.7	52.5
Fairly low	36.6	32.9	37.5
Very low	5.3	9.8	4.1
Compared with that of five years ago, the morale of other faculty seems to be–			
Very high	8.9%	7.8%	9.1%
Fairly high	40.2	37.0	41.0
Fairly low	35.1	32.5	35.9
Very low	15.8	22.7	14.0

TABLE 5.–FACULTY OPINION ABOUT CONSIDERATIONS RELATED TO FACULTY MORALE

Question and answer category	Percent of faculty: Total faculty	Faculty in 2-year institutions	Faculty in 4-year or higher degree-granting institutions
1	2	3	4
How would you describe the degree of academic freedom afforded faculty at the institution that employs you?			
Great freedom–all that most faculty members would want or expect	27.4%	22.9%	28.5%
Much freedom–a general feeling of freedom	46.5	48.2	46.1
Fair degree of freedom–there are some important constraints	23.1	24.7	22.7
Little freedom–a general feeling of constraint; an uncomfortable situation	3.0	4.2	2.7
Are the due process procedures for assuring faculty at your institution just treatment in salary, welfare, and academic matters adequate or do they need improvement?			
Many improvements are needed	17.3%	24.7%	15.3%
Some improvements are needed	41.8	42.2	41.7
A few improvements are needed	21.2	16.9	22.3
Current procedures are adequate	19.8	16.3	20.7
How would you describe the status of your institution in the number of faculty employed part time, considering the conditions of enrollment, faculty expertise, location of classes, and desirability of full-time employment opportunities?			
Too many part-time faculty	23.7%	42.9%	18.7%
Too few part-time faculty	7.1	2.5	8.4
Reasonable balance between number of part-time and full-time faculty	69.1	54.7	73.0
Higher education faculty have no reason to be concerned over the number of faculty employed part time in higher education.			
Strongly agree	4.7%	5.5%	4.6%
Tend to agree	15.1	9.1	16.7
Tend to disagree	43.5	32.7	46.3
Strongly disagree	36.7	52.7	32.4
Declines in college-age population are not likely to affect my institution as adversely as other institutions.			
Strongly agree	6.9%	4.2%	7.6%
Tend to agree	40.6	36.4	41.7
Tend to disagree	31.6	29.1	32.3
Strongly disagree	20.9	30.3	18.3

TABLE 6.–SELECTED INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT CHARACTERISTICS RELATED TO FACULTY MORALE AND PERCENT OF FACULTY INDICATING THAT THEIR CONDITION IS LESS THAN SATISFACTORY

Condition	Percent of faculty reporting condition is less than satisfactory or unsatisfactory[a]		
	Total faculty	Faculty in 2-year institutions	Faculty in 4-year or higher degree-granting institutions
1	2	3	4
Faculty opinion is elicited on issues being considered by local administration	54.5%	59.8%	53.2%
Faculty concerns and problems are communicated to local administration	43.7	42.7	43.9
Faculty priorities and interests are communicated to institution's board of directors	61.2	62.0	61.0
Faculty are advised about process for giving input to institutional planning and governance decisions	51.5	60.6	49.1
Faculty member who has a complaint with local administrator has access to advice and support	51.8	55.9	50.7
Faculty have access to information and advice about their employment rights	25.4	27.1	25.0
Faculty receive information on their own salaries, fringe benefits, perquisites, and options	16.3	17.0	16.1
Faculty receive summary information about salaries paid to other faculty in the institution[b]	57.7	54.7	58.5
Faculty have access to descriptions of institutional work load policy	44.2	33.4	47.0
Faculty interests are communicated to state legislature[b]	67.6	67.5	67.6

[a]Other options were "highly satisfactory" and "satisfactory."
[b]More than 20 percent indicated condition is "unsatisfactory, much improvement needed."

TABLE 7.–PERCENT OF FACULTY REPORTING OPINION THAT IMPROVEMENTS ARE NEEDED IN CERTAIN INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES

Practice	Percent of faculty indicating some or major improvement needed[a]		
	Total faculty	Faculty in 2-year institutions	Faculty in 4-year or higher degree-granting institutions
1	2	3	4
Sabbatical leave policies[b]	34.7%	33.3%	35.1%
Availability of travel funds	66.8	62.5	67.8
Financial support for professional growth	69.1	66.1	70.0
Sick leave provisions	15.6	15.7	15.6
Parking facilities	33.7	28.3	35.1
Faculty evaluation	56.7	57.0	56.7
Salary (academic year)			
–amount	70.5	69.4	70.8
–equity among faculty	64.8	57.4	66.7
Salary (summer session)	53.6	54.6	53.3
Clear definition of faculty merit	74.8	71.3	75.6
Formal reporting to faculty about their evaluation	54.0	42.0	57.2
Promotion policies	57.6	58.5	57.4
Student/faculty ratio	46.1	47.9	45.6
Teaching materials and equipment	49.7	44.5	51.0
Standards for notice of non-reappointment	29.5	26.9	30.2
Summer employment[c]	37.0	35.8	37.4
Maternity leave[d]	19.9	14.2	21.7
Child care services[e]	33.2	31.5	33.8
Faculty load (hours)	51.6	53.7	51.1

[a] Sum of the percents of faculty indicating "some improvement needed" and "major improvement needed." Other response options included "no provision" and "satisfactory."

[b] "No provision," reported by 13.1 percent of faculty.

[c] "No provision," reported by 7.1 percent.

[d] "No provision," reported by 14.0 percent.

[e] "No provision," reported by 33.0 percent.

TABLE 8.–PERCENT OF FACULTY WHO ARE INADEQUATELY REPRESENTED IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND/OR IMPLEMENTATION OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES

Policy area	Percent reporting faculty have too little representation[a]		
	Total faculty	Faculty in 2-year institutions	Faculty in 4-year or higher degree-granting institutions
1	2	3	4
Addition or deletion of courses	11.9%	27.6%	7.7%
Addition or deletion of programs	25.9	36.2	23.2
Tenure provisions	31.5	34.6	30.7
Promotion standards	37.2	42.0	36.0
Faculty evaluation	29.8	30.9	29.5
Faculty leaves of absence[b]	30.8	35.4	29.6
Criteria for student admission[c]	40.1	46.5	38.4
Faculty performance standards	36.4	39.8	35.5
Criteria for faculty censure or dismissal	41.9	50.3	39.6
Criteria for selection of new faculty	27.3	41.0	23.7
Criteria for selection of campus-level administrators	57.5	61.5	56.5
Faculty load	46.6	47.2	46.5

[a]Other options to the question were "too much faculty representation," "faculty representation about right," and "no faculty representation needed."

[b]"No faculty representation needed," reported by 10.0 percent of faculty.

[c]"No faculty representation needed," reported by 7.2 percent.

The Technical Aspects of the Study

The two-stage random sample was designed to obtain national estimates within 5 percent of the true value at a confidence level of 90 percent. For the first stage, a probability sample of institutions was drawn from the total file of institutions classified by type and control into the following four strata: public universities, public other 4-year institutions, private universities and other 4-year institutions, and 2-year institutions. For the second stage, faculty names were selected from rosters for the selected institutions by using sampling fractions to provide a self-weighting sample of instructional faculty.

Questionnaires were sent to 1,508 faculty—one person for every 300 full-time faculty members in the United States. However, it was later learned that 80 of these persons should not have been included in the survey because they either were employed in full-time administration, full-time research, professional support staff positions or were no longer employed in higher education. The 803 faculty returning completed questionnaires represent 56.2 percent of the 1,428 persons estimated to have been an appropriate part of the sample. Although this is a disappointing rate of response, it is not unexpected in view of the 60- to 65-percent response rates in other recent surveys of higher education faculty.

Need for caution. The low rate of response indicates the need for caution in interpreting results. In addition, some chance for bias in the final sample results from the method used to select the faculty sample and in the characteristics of nonrespondents. These conditions make it necessary to view the findings of this research with appropriate restraint.

The method used to select the persons in the sample plus an expected higher-than-average rate of response from faculty familiar with NEA's purposes and programs may have contributed to unequal representation of some subgroupings of faculty among the respondents.

Selection of the sample. Names for the sample were identified from the institution's published catalog, and most of these catalogs were published before the beginning of the 1977-78 session. Therefore, the sample probably underrepresents the new (beginning and mobile) faculty who joined the institution in 1977-78.

In addition, lists from which the sample was selected included faculty who were leaving the institution between 1976-77 and 1977-78. Among these mobile faculty selected for the sample, some probably did not receive the questionnaire at their new institution, or they may not have continued their employment in higher education.

Distribution by rank. Faculty in the lower ranks either tend to be new to the institution or to have moved from an institution. Therefore, the present sample probably underrepresents faculty in the lower ranks.

The U.S. Office of Education's spring 1963 survey of teaching faculty in 4-year colleges and universities found that the following percents of faculty were not at their present institution the previous year (1961-62): professors (16 percent), associate professors (17 percent), assistant professors (24 percent), instructors (36 percent), and other ranks (17 percent).

The percent of faculty in the NEA survey who were at their present institutions the previous year is higher for the combined ranks of professor and associate professor (95.0 percent) than for the lower ranks as a whole (92.5 percent). The percent of faculty in the present survey who plan to be at the same institution for the subsequent year is higher for the combined ranks of professor and associate professor (95.1 percent) than for the

TABLE 9.—HIGHER EDUCATION FACULTY WHO HAVE TAUGHT IN ELEMENTARY OR SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Grouping of faculty	Percent with elementary-secondary teaching experience
Total	37.5%
2-year institutions	44.3
Public universities	20.9
Public other 4-year	42.3
All private universities and other 4-year institutions	31.2
Age	
Under 38 years	24.8
38 through 52	43.2
53 or more	43.3
Men	33.1
Women	50.2
Professor and associate professor	31.5
Other ranks	45.1

lower ranks combined (84.1 percent). Expectation of being employed at a different institution of higher education is reported by 0.9 percent of faculty in the top two ranks combined and by 4.4 percent of faculty in the lower ranks.

A faculty member familiar with NEA's objectives may have been more willing than other faculty to respond to the questionnaire. Because over two-thirds of public school teachers are NEA members and most K-12 teachers are represented by an NEA affiliate, faculty who have had teaching experience at the elementary-secondary level are probably more aware of NEA than are most other higher education faculty (see Table 9).

Table 9 supports the hypotheses that the NEA sample contains (1) a higher-than-representative proportion of faculty in the higher ranks and (2) a higher-than-representative number of women and of mature faculty in the lower ranks in public institutions.

TABLE 10.–POPULATION AND SAMPLE ESTIMATES OF FACULTY DISTRIBUTED BY RANK AND TYPE OF INSTITUTION, AND OF FACULTY WHO ARE WOMEN IN EACH RANK AND TYPE OF INSTITUTION CATEGORY

Faculty group	Percent of faculty	
	Population 1975-76	Sample 1977-78
1	2	3
Rank		
Professor	23.1%	30.0%
Associate professor	23.4	26.1
Assistant professor	28.1	25.0
Instructor	19.5	11.9
Lecturer	1.4	1.3
Not designated	4.5	5.7
Percent in rank who are women		
Professor	9.6	13.4
Associate professor	17.1	18.3
Assistant professor	28.8	30.2
Instructor	40.6	52.6
Lecturer	41.4	40.0
Rank not designated	33.2	37.2
Type of institution		
University or other 4-year	77.7	79.2
2-year	22.3	20.8
Percent in type of institution who are women		
University or other 4-year	21.6	20.9
2-year	33.7	43.6
Total percent who are women	24.3	25.6

Some sample estimates along with statistics for the total population in 1975-76 derived from the Higher Education General Information Survey by the National Center for Education Statistics are listed in Table 10. Barring changes since 1975-76 the sample contains slightly larger-than-representative numbers of faculty with the rank of professor and slightly smaller-than-representative numbers of faculty with rank of instructor. It contains slightly larger-than-representative numbers of women faculty in the ranks of professor and instructor and in the 2-year institutions (see Table 10.)

A review of faculty distribution by age and by highest earned degree (as estimated from the present survey) compared to other population estimates may help evaluate how much the bias in the present survey may influence the overall findings. Also, comparison of survey estimates during recent years may provide useful indications of trends in selected characteristics of higher education faculty.

Distribution by age. Estimates of faculty distribution by age as identified in recent surveys of essentially comparable populations are summarized in Table 11.

A trend toward increasing percents of faculty who are 50 or more years of age and a trend of lower percentages of faculty who are under age 35 are both evident (see Table 11). The termination of an era of significant annual growth in numbers of full-time faculty occurring about 1975 may be expected to continue to reduce the number of beginning faculty being hired. An increasingly tight market for higher education faculty positions since the early 1970's may also be expected to reduce the percents of faculty separating from their employment in higher education. The range of normal variation associated with sample estimates coupled with the likely trends toward an aging faculty in higher education suggest that the estimates from the present survey probably represent the total population of higher education faculty.

Distribution by educational attainment. The distribution of faculty by their highest earned degree suggests that more higher education faculty are earning the doctor's degree (see Table 12). The summary also documents the variation associated with estimates from sample surveys. The absence of growth in total number of faculty and the increasingly tight faculty job market (with the annual number of doctor's degree recipients over three times as large as it was in 1960-61) support the expectation that there would be recent increases

in the proportion of higher education faculty with the doctor's degree.

A recent study of educational qualifications of new faculty employed in other 4-year institutions and 2-year institutions supplied estimates consistent with the trend shown above. An American Council on Education study of "other 4-year" institutions reported that 52.9 percent of new faculty in selected disciplines in 1976-77 had the doctor's degree or were expected to obtain this degree within two years (see Reference 6).

An NEA Research survey of higher education institutions regarding faculty supply and demand in 1963-64 and 1964-65 concluded that only 19.5 to 22.4 percent of new faculty in these disciplines employed in other 4-year institutions during those years had obtained the doctor's degree (see Reference 7). The range in the NEA Research estimates reflects probable differences between the NEA and the ACE studies in the criteria for classifying institutions as universities. The ACE study defined *new* faculty as those who *had not been previously* employed in higher education. The NEA Research study defined *new* faculty as those who had not taught in higher education the *preceding year* and counted as having the doctor's degree only those faculty who had received this degree.

The percent of new faculty in 2-year institutions having the doctor's degree was 10.6 percent in the ACE study for 1976-77, but 7.3 percent in the NEA study for 1963-64 and 1964-65.

TABLE 11.–SAMPLING ESTIMATES OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION FACULTY BY AGE, 1948 TO 1978

Year and source of estimate	Percent of faculty		
	Under age 35	Age 35 through 49 years	Age 50 years or more
1	2	3	4
1948–U.S. Office of Education (1)	32.0%	45.6%	22.5%
1969–American Council on Education (3)[a]	33.4	43.2	23.4
1970–NEA Research	27.6	46.6	25.8
1973–American Council on Education (4)[a]	23.0	47.7	29.2
1976–NEA Research	25.4	45.7	28.9
1978–NEA Research	18.3	52.6	29.0

SOURCES: Numbers in parentheses refer to the numbered references at the end of this report.

[a] ACE's intervals were "under 36 years," "36-50 years," "51 or more years."

TABLE 12.–ESTIMATES OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION BY HIGHEST EARNED DEGREE, 1948 TO 1978

Year and source	Percent of faculty		
	Bachelor's degree	Master's, professional, or technical degree (3)	Doctor's degree
1	2	3	4
1948–U.S. Office of Education (1)	17.0[a,b]	45.2	37.8
1965–NEA Research	5.3	45.3	49.4
1968–USOE–NCES (2)[c]	8.6	49.7	41.7
1969–American Council on Education (3)	6.7[b]	48.2	45.0
1973–American Council on Education (4)	6.7[b]	54.3	39.0
1976–NEA Research	3.9	40.6	55.5
1978–NEA Research	3.3	36.0	60.7

SOURCES: Numbers in parentheses refer to the numbered references at the end of this report.

[a] Includes first professional degree.

[b] Includes also less than bachelor's degree.

[c] Data for entire population.

These recent findings from the ACE study, added to previous evidence of trends toward lower rates of separation from employment, particularly among senior faculty, suggest that the proportion of higher education faculty with the doctor's degree has recently increased. However, other evidence that faculty in the upper ranks may be slightly overrepresented in the present survey suggests that the proportion of faculty having the doctor's degree may not be quite as high as is estimated by these data.

Conclusion. The statistics derived from the present survey generally represent the total group of teaching faculty in higher education. Consideration should be given, however, to the small overrepresentation of faculty with the rank of professor and the underrepresentation of faculty with the rank of instructor. These factors and the usual expectations of variation associated with sample survey estimates demand the use of caution in interpreting the findings.

REFERENCES

1. Story, Robert C., and Guewa, Ann. *Survey of Salaries and Occupational Attitudes of Faculty Personnel of Higher Education, 1947-48.* Circular No. 254. Washington, D.C.: Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, March 15, 1949.
2. Beazley, Richard M. *Numbers and Characteristics of Employees in Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1967.* OE-50057-67. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1970. 85 pp.
3. Bayer, Alan E. "College and University Faculty: A Statistical Description." *ACE Research Reports.* Volume 5, No. 5. June 1970. 48 pp.
4. Bayer, Alan E. "Teaching Faculty in Academe: 1972-73." *ACE Research Reports.* Volume 8, No. 2. 1973. 68 pp.
5. Dunham, Ralph E.; Wright, Patricia S.; and Chandler, Marjorie O. *Teaching Faculty in Universities and Four-Year Colleges, Spring 1963.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1966. 178 pp.
6. Atelsek, Frank J., and Gomberg, Irene L. *New Full-Time Faculty 1976-77: Hiring Patterns by Field and Educational Attainment.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education (Higher Education Panel Reports, No. 38.), March 1978.
7. Maul, Ray C. *Teacher Supply and Demand in Universities, Colleges, and Junior Colleges, 1963-64 and 1964-65.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Research (Research Report 1965-R4.), April 1965.